



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,609	02/18/2004	Farni Weaver	2284	2700
28005	7590	11/29/2007		
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER PEACHES, RANDY	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,609

Applicant(s)

WEAVER, FARNI

Examiner

Randy Peaches

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23 and 25-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. ***Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 14-17, 23, 28 and 30*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1) in view of Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) in further view of Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1).

Regarding ***claims 1, 14, 23, 28 and 30***, Jiang et al. discloses a method for delivering electronic messages including a delay indicator, comprising:

- sending, from a subscriber/user, which reads on claimed "message sender," a service request for a delay report. Jiang et al. discloses in paragraph [0027] that a request is sent via a subscriber ;
- receiving a request for a delay report. See Jiang et al. paragraph [0028];
- determining an expected delay for delivery of an electronic message. See Jiang et al. paragraph [0028, 0015, 0016];
- sending a delay report to the subscriber/user, wherein the delay report includes information on the length of the expected delay. See paragraph [0033 and 0016];

- Jiang et al. further teaches that based on the delay report, determining, at the said subscriber/user, whether to send the said electronic message.

However, Jiang et al. fails to clearly disclose which device is receiving the said request from the subscriber/user in order to determine the expected delay for the delivery of the said electronic message.

Ament teaches in paragraph [0020, 0034] of a resource manager (1), which reads on claimed "delay manager," which after receiving a request for a delay report, determines the expected delay for the delivery of the said electronic message. Once this step is completed, Ament further discloses in paragraph [0043] of an application (8), which reads on claimed "message gateway," which uses the information from the said resource manager in the "use" phase (15). It is here in the use phase (15), as interpreted by the Examiner, that the messages are sent and processed according to the information received from the said resource manager (1). Ament further discloses that the function of the said resource manager (1) is to provide a resource counter, resource information, resource conflict (which is interpreted by the Examiner as delay), stipulate resources and resource use. See Ament paragraph [0022].

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1) to include Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) in order to provide a central device (resource manger) that determines the expected delay of an electronic message being requested to be transmitted by a said subscriber/user.

However, the combination of Jiang et al. and Ament fails to clearly disclose wherein based on the delay report received from the said resource manger, determining at the said subscriber/user whether the information presented is less than a predetermined threshold delay and if so, sending the said electronic message to a said application (8) only after determining that the expected delay is less than a threshold delay.

Rozhavsky et al. discloses in paragraph [0039] the expected delay is less than a threshold delay.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1) and Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) to further include Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) in order to be able to carry out a successful resource management by comparing the internal threshold delay with the actual threshold to effectively make a determination whether to complete the transmission of the said electronic message.

Regarding **claim 2**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, Jiang et al. continues to disclose wherein the request for a delay report is a delay query. See paragraph [0031].

Regarding **claim 3**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, Jiang et al. disclose wherein the request

for a delay report is a subscription request. Jiang et al. teaches in paragraph [0030] wherein a service request can be a request by a subscriber to gain access to a service.

Regarding **claim 4**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, Jiang et al. discloses wherein determining the expected delay includes measuring an actual delay time for the delivery of a test message. See paragraphs [0016 and 0031].

Regarding **claim 5**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, Jiang et al. discloses wherein the expected delay is determined at least in part from the number of messages (system load). See paragraphs [0016 and 0017].

Regarding **claims 7 and 17**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 1 and 14**, Jiang et al. discloses wherein the delay report sent to the said subscriber/user is one of a plurality of delay reports sent periodically to the sender. See paragraph [0016].

Regarding **claims 9 and 15-16**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 1 and 14**, Jiang et al. discloses wherein the delay report is sent in response to a delay query from the said subscriber/user. See paragraph [0027].

Regarding **claim 10**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, Jiang et al. discloses wherein the delay report includes the length of the expected delay. See paragraph [0016-0017].

2. **Claims 6,8,11-13,18-20,25-27,29 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further include Chung Kam chung et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,502 B1).

Regarding **claims 6 and 27**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 5 and 14**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein the application is a bulk message gateway.

Chung Kam chung et al. wherein the said MSC is a bulk message gateway. See column 9 lines 37-41.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further include Chung Kam chung et al. in order to provide a system which included a said application capable of handling a plurality of message (bulk).

Regarding **claims 8, 11, 18-20 and 31**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 1, 17 and 30**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein the expected delay has fallen below a threshold delay, wherein the delay report is sent in response to the determination that the expected delay has fallen below the threshold delay.

Chung Kam chung et al. disclose wherein the expected delay has fallen below a threshold delay, wherein the delay report is sent in response to the determination that the expected delay has fallen below the threshold delay. See column 7 lines 59-67 and column 10 lines 36-65.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further include Chung Kam chung et al. in order to be able to carry out a successful resource management by comparing the internal threshold delay with the actual threshold to effectively make a determination whether to complete the transmission of the said electronic message.

Regarding **claims 12 and 21**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 1 and 14**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein the electronic message is a short message service message.

Chung Kam chung et al. discloses wherein the electronic message is a short message service message. See Column 5 lines 27-33.

Regarding **claim 13**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 1**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein the delay reports are a session initiation protocol message.

Chung Kam chung et al. discloses claim 1, wherein the delay report may be in different formats depending on the protocol, which can include session initiation protocol message. See column 7 lines 1-11.

Regarding **claim 25**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claim 23**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein the report generator is operative to determine when the expected delay falls below a threshold delay and the report generator is further operative to generate a delay report in response to the expected delay falling below the threshold delay.

Chung Kam chung et al. wherein the

- report generator is operative to determine when the expected delay falls below a threshold delay. See column 7 lines 54-67; and

- the report generator is further operative to generate a delay report in response to the expected delay falling below the threshold delay. See column 7 lines 54-67.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further include Chung Kam chung et al. in order to be able to carry out a successful resource management by comparing the internal threshold delay with the actual threshold to effectively make a determination whether to complete the transmission of the said electronic message.

Regarding **claims 26 and 29**, as the combination of Jiang et al., Ament and Rozhavsky et al. are made, the combination according to **claims 23 and 28**, the combination fails to clearly disclose wherein said delay estimator determines the expected delay based at least in part on the number of messages queued at a message gateway.

Chung Kam chung et al. wherein the said delay estimator determines the expected delay based at least in part on the number of messages queued at a message gateway. See column 7 lines 42-67.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further

include Chung Kam chung et al. in order to be able to carry out a successful resource management by comparing the internal threshold delay with the actual threshold to effectively make a determination whether to complete the transmission of the said electronic message.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, filed 5/21/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-31 under **35 USC § 103** have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the combination of Jiang et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0096059 A1), Ament (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0105436 A1) and Rozhavsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/0127176 A1) to further include Chung Kam chung et al.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy Peaches whose telephone number is (571) 272-7914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Randy Peaches
RP


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER